

# The Jewish Mentality Book I

**Copyright ©1996 by Michael A. Hoffman II. All Rights Reserved.**

The Campaign for Radical Truth in History

<http://www.hoffman-info.com>

P.O. Box 849, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83816 USA. Send \$1.00 for our catalog.

Your financial donation = our campaign's survival. Donate today!

---

Partial list of Contents: Churchill: Politically Correct Exterminator; Hitler: The Dupe of "Jewjitsu;" Just Law Enforcement, Not Persecution; Deep into the Psychology of Opposition; Tall Tales; Jailers, Inquisitors and Thought Controllers; Lying as an Institution.

---

## **Turning the Tables: A Revaluation**

All learning is based upon curiosity and curiosity is the unfettered exploration of that which is interesting. The weird halo of immunity which surrounds the Jewish nation is a highly interesting sanction and no scholar must be faulted for defying it. To pretend that we must approach the Jewish studies with some special reverence and reserve, fearful of causing offense, is a totalitarian expectation.

It will undoubtedly be the first reaction of a mind-zapped populace to immediately regard the investigation of the negative factors within the religion of Judaism as a horrible one, "bound to lead to another 'Holocaust.'"

That the fanatical chauvinism of Jewish partisanship has been absorbed into the body politic of the masses of non-Jews to such an overwhelming extent is a high tribute to the power and effectiveness of Jewish propaganda.

But this writing is not an attack but a defense. [Khazars](#) attack Christianity every week in a newspaper column, magazine article, radio report, film, television show or book. Few people regard such attacks as a prelude to the further decay and eventual destruction of the Gentile people of the West. Such Jewish attacks on Christianity are regarded as the "normal criticism" any creed must endure at the hands of truth-seekers, scientists and dispassionate scholars.

Within this framework is the presumption of immunity for Judaism. According to the mindset promoted by the System's public schools and private universities and the Established "media" organs of mass communication, Judaism alone among the religions of the world is immune from scholarly criticism. First because it is perfect, being the creed of God's Master or "Chosen" Race and second because, even if it were as flawed to the degree that secular agnosticism asserts that every religion is flawed, it would still be wrong to expose it as such because to do so will lead to another "Holocaust."

If one looks beneath the sham appearances of this late 20th century, that is to say beyond the shuttered provincialism of Jew-worship, one glimpses the outlines of war. A relentless libel is directed at the Christian West, or what remains of it in the ruins, in the aftermath of a half-century of constant propaganda against it. It must be relentless to insure that no smoldering spark shall leap up to illuminate the perpetual dark night of the modern era.

The story of the crucifixion of an honest man at the behest of the Jewish religious and political leadership, whose heroic commitment to the truth above all else, testified to his divine patrimony, has been for 2,000 years a permanent stumbling block to the ascendance of Jewish world supremacy. Therefore every attack upon the historical reality of this story and the person and morality of Jesus has been launched by the Khazars.

Where that has proved insufficient, the new state religion of "Holocaust" Newspeak (absent from dictionaries before 1978) has been established by all Western governments and by all hireling priests and preachers. By this means Auschwitz is made to replace Calvary as the *axis mundi* of Western history. Though the tale of the destruction of the Khazars during World War Two has been wildly and shamelessly exaggerated out of all proportion to what actually occurred in that time, there is no doubt that Jewish people were murdered in the hundreds of thousands and that this was a horrible crime.

But what is never factored into the equation as the indictment of the West is prepared on this basis, is the fact that Hitler and his National Socialist German Worker's Party rose to a fury of indignation against Jewish people directly as a result of what Jewish communists like Trotsky (actual name: Leon Bronstein) and Lenin and the thoroughly-Jewish Bolshevik communist party in Moscow had done to the Christian peasantry of Mother Russia, which the Germans regarded as every inch a "holocaust." (The Jewish extraction of Lenin's mother has long been known to many Russian historians and party bureaucrats with access to inside information. Cf. "Who was a Jew? Why, Lenin of Course!", *Jerusalem Post International Edition*, Jan. 26, 1991, and Dimitry Volkogonov, *Lenin: A New Biography*).

Both the Jewish historian Arno Mayer in his book *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?* and the German professor of history Ernst Nolte have noted the essential link between what the Jewish communists did to Christians in Russia as the basis for retribution against Jewish people in German-occupied territories.

As Prof. Nolte points out, the Jewish communists in Russia founded their ideology on the demand for extermination on a huge scale. In September of 1918 Jewish communist Grigori Zinoviev advocated the extermination of ten million Russians. In 1919 Lenin called for the deaths of millions of Christian peasants --the *kulaks*.

"...for Hitler, Bolshevism was a genuinely terrible vision constantly before the eyes." (Ernst Nolte, "The Holocaust Must Be Seen in Context," *The Independent*, Nov. 5, 1988).

The horrors of Jewish Bolshevism is a vision almost never seen on our telescreens or newspaper pages. The media of mass communications have been dominated by Khazars and their sympathizers almost since its inception. (Cf. Neal Gabler, *How the Jews Invented Hollywood* and William Cash, "Kings of the Deal," *The Spectator*, Oct. 29, 1994).

The myth is that Jews were regarded suspiciously in Germany in the 1930s and eventually punished solely due to sheer Teutonic or Christian cruelty and irrational hatred. Policed entirely out of the agenda is the fact that while Nazism was rising in Germany in the 1930s, Jewish Communist commissars were administering death camps and gulags for millions of Christians trapped inside the borders of the Soviet empire, a fact never revealed in "Holocaust" studies or movies.

While Khazars cry the loudest whenever any group or force obstructs their ambitions--these cries being infinitely magnified by the unprecedented brainwashing abilities of the electronic visual media--it does not necessarily follow that Khazars are in fact the most persecuted or long-suffering of the peoples of the world.

The full, graphic account of what the Jewish Communists did to Russia and Eastern Europe has yet to be told.

Another objection to this writing will be that it is, by definition "neo-Nazi" and "crypto-fascist" simply because it does actually dare to do what Jewish historians and writers do weekly to Christianity: criticize it.

### **Winston Churchill: The Politically Correct Exterminator**

Then there is the "extermination" issue. If one attempts a revaluation of the Communist propaganda about Germany which has been absorbed into the body politic of the capitalist West, one is met with the cry of being "an apologist for exterminators." Such lofty moralizing does not even begin to signify anything unless it is consistent. The same critique, then, must be launched against all those "conservatives" and pseudo-"Christians" who defend or admire Winston Churchill. If Churchill is absolved, one can expect some revisionists to also absolve Hitler.

For it is no less a democratic icon than Winston Churchill who advocated the extermination of the civilian population of Germany through air strikes on all German city centers. On July 8, 1940 Churchill wrote that what was needed against the Germans was, "an absolutely devastating, exterminating attack by very heavy bombers on the Nazi homeland..." (Source: Geoffrey Wheatcroft, *Spectator*, Sept. 29, 1979).

In 1956 Churchill told President Eisenhower, "I am, of course, a Zionist, and have been ever since the Balfour Declaration." (Herbert Mitgang, "The Official Churchill in One Volume," *N.Y. Times*, Nov. 6, 1991).

This campaign of Allied extermination of the German people had been inaugurated on May 11, 1940 when the Royal Air Force (R.A.F.) *was the first to bomb cities, in this case, German cities:*

*"Churchill ordered a series of night raids on Berlin for the specific purpose of diverting German attacks from the airfields of London. After Berlin was attacked six times, the German air force was ordered to attack London, and, as Churchill anticipated, the pressure on the airfields was relieved. Thus began the blitz."* (Benjamin Colby, *Twas a Famous Victory*, p.173, emphasis supplied).

But it would not be until Arthur Harris became commander-in-chief of the R.A.F.'s Bomber Command in February of 1942 that Churchill's plan for the extermination of the German people by fire was attempted with total commitment. "Harris was...single-minded in his aim: the systematic destruction of German cities....His new campaign was inaugurated on March 28, 1942 with the 234-aircraft attack on Lubeck, a medieval town, strategically insignificant but in Harris's words, 'more like a fire-lighter than a human habitation.' Lubeck was burned to the ground, the first of many...

"The Ruhr towns were attacked from March to June 1943, Hamburg from July to November, Berlin from November until March, 1944...Using much more sophisticated techniques of electronic navigation, of marking and of bombing, the city was first broken up by explosives-- 'cookies' designed to blow open doors and windows--and then rained with incendiaries. Repeated raids overwhelmed the civil defense and fire services. Bomber Command attacked Hamburg on 24 July, again on 27 July, with American attacks in between. The raid of the 27th created a vast firestorm, destroying 22 square kilometres of the city and killing an estimated 42,000 people. Fifteen months later Harris would boast that Bomber Command 'has virtually destroyed 45 out of the leading 60 German cities...

"One undefended city after another was devastated from end to end by explosion and fire, 'brownd' as the repellent R.A.F. phrase had it...Darmstadt was a beautiful old town in south-west Germany, economically insignificant and untouched until 11 September 1944, when it was 'brownd' and 12,300 of its inhabitants were killed...

"The most famous target in this last phase was Dresden in February, 1945...But Dresden was no different in kind from the other terror raids before...(A month later) Wurzburg...a town of complete (military) unimportance...16 March, 1945...Bomber Command razed the town to the ground in slightly less than 20 minutes. Wurzburg, like 600,000 German (civilians), had surrendered unconditionally.

"What was especially reprehensible was the way in which Churchill tried at the end of the war to disassociate himself from the bombing... After the war Churchill could still write--privately--to an air marshal: 'We should never allow ourselves to apologize for what we did to Germany.' But he had the instincts of a professional politician, and foresaw a reaction. On 28 March 1945 he drafted a memorandum: 'It seems to me the moment has come when the question of bombing of German cities simply for the sake of increasing the terror, though under other pretexts, should be reviewed.

"... it (is) impossible for an Englishman born after the war to travel through Germany without a sense of shame...seeing medieval Nuremburg which Allied aircraft burnt to the ground and where Allied prosecutors had the effrontery to accuse Goering and Kesselring of bombing Coventry and Rotterdam...' ( Wheatcroft, *Spectator*, op. cit. Also cf. Max Hastings, *Bomber Command*.).

Christopher Mayhew, former President of the Oxford Union and a British soldier stationed in Germany wrote: "Have you seen a blitzed town? London isn't blitzed. Norwich is practically undamaged, a prosperous peaceful town. German towns are blitzed." (*London Review of Books*, June 20, 1985, p.8).

### **Franklin D. Roosevelt: Another Accomplice in the Attempted Extermination of the German People**

Americans too are culpable. As historian Ronald Schaffer has documented, President Franklin D. Roosevelt approved and encouraged the mass murder of German women and children by the U.S. Army Air Force. A top Roosevelt staff adviser, David T. Griggs, stated the administration's military policy explicitly when he wrote that the effort of the U.S. air forces "should be directed to the disruption of the German economy and the terrorization of the German people." (Ronald Schaffer, *Wings of Judgment: American Bombing in World War Two*, p. 94).

It was American P-51 Mustang pilots who swooped down along the banks of the river Elbe as masses of terrified German women and children huddled in the daylight aftermath of the firebombing of Dresden. The pilots machine-gunned these pitiful survivors en masse.

In the decay of language that is a signpost of the Orwellian dissolution of independent thinking in our time, the word holocaust, which by original definition denotes death by fire, is now assigned almost exclusively to the deaths of Jews, allegedly by gas. 600,000 German civilians deliberately burned alive as Allied policy, receive no such "holocaust

victim" status. In fact, it is regarded as some sort of blasphemy against the canons of "The Holocaust" civic religion that anyone other than a victim of Hitler is described thus.

But anyone who takes the time and trouble to read the official *Strategic Bombing Survey*, prepared by the U.S. War Department, under the section "Morale Division-Medical Branch Report: The Effect of Bombing on Health and Medical Care in Germany," will find horrific photographs and testimony which testifying that the "holocaust" victims of World War Two also included the German civilians and in the Pacific theatre, the civilian residents of Tokyo, Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

One survivor of the holocaust *against* the German people was Helga Hudepohl who wrote, "I was in the isolation ward of a clearly marked children's hospital in a rural area some 50 miles out side the city (of Berlin), 7 years old and ill with scarlet fever, when the hospital was bombed to bits and pieces by Harris' jolly group...Had there really been a fair 'Judgement at Nuremberg,' Harris would have been one of the accused and have been sent to the gallows as a war criminal." (Letters, *N.Y. Times*, Jan. 18, 1992, p. 22).

The deliberate extermination of the German people through air power resounded among military forces on the ground through the mouthpiece of the chief propagandist for the Soviet empire, the Jewish Communist communications genius, Ilya Ehrenberg. While any college kid can invoke the name of Joseph Goebbels as eponymous with propaganda, Ehrenburg's contribution to this infernal science is virtually unknown.

It was Ehrenburg who urged the troops of the Red Army, as they advanced upon the eastern borders of a prostrate and defeated Germany, to rape and kill every German civilian they could find. Every German girl over the age of eight in the German village of Nemmersdorf was raped. German women were nailed to the sides of barns.

At Yalta and Potsdam Truman and Churchill approved Stalin's call for the forced deportation of millions of ethnic Germans in those territories ceded to him. This resulted in the mass deportation of all Germans from lands east of the rivers Oder and Neisse. Thousands of German civilians were crammed into railroad cattle cars by the Communists. Those Soviet trains arrived in Berlin with a cargo of dead and dying German children packed like sardines. No "holocaust" movies have been made about the plight of these hapless children. They were of the wrong nationality and religion.

In Czechoslovakia in July, 1945, German women and children were tossed from bridges and more than 2,000 massacred.

By the end of 1946, German civilians in the British-occupied zone were receiving as little as 400 calories of food per day--half the ration the inmates at Belsen had received under the Nazis.

When the post-war expulsions and pogroms were over, two million German civilians were dead and fourteen million driven from their ancestral lands in one of the greatest acts of population-transfer in modern history.

We are told that World War Two was "the Good War" against "Germany, a nation conceived in hell itself" (Leslie Gelb, *NY Times*), "the greatest evil ever produced on earth" (Simon Schama).

But in so far as our psyche can disengage itself from Jewish demonizing, the reality is that WWII was a total war, an "unlimited, unconditional war" against not just Hitler and the Nazis but German women, children and defenseless elderly who were held to be collectively guilty.

President Roosevelt stated, "The German people as a whole must have it driven home to them that the whole nation has been engaged in a lawless conspiracy against the decencies of civilization." (Robert Dallek, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy*, pp. 472-473).

To teach them these "decencies," Mr. Roosevelt sanctioned the policies of the extirpation of German women and children through air force bombs and pal "Uncle Joe" Stalin's awfully decent Red Army.

Can there be any bloodier a killer on the earth than the do-gooder liberal? Roosevelt's mentality was first echoed in the U.S. in Abraham Lincoln's abolitionist legions who were going to punish the South for its "sins."

Maximillien Robespierre, leader of the French Revolution and the "reign of terror," wrote: "It is necessary to exterminate all those vile and scoundrelly beings who conspire eternally against the rights of man and against the happiness of all people."

A Jewish N.Y. Times editor, Judith Miller, along with most of the kept press, indicted the Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran for demanding of Iraq only "unconditional surrender" during the Iran-Iraq war. (*N.Y. Times*, May 17, 1992, p. E-3).

In the Jewish mentality, only the enemies of Judaism must be fought unconditionally.

From this mentality was born Menachem Begin's Beirut, Lebanon, August, 1982 and George Bush's Baghdad, Iraq, 1991. In both wars the indiscriminate bombing of the civilian population was central to military strategy, all in the name of sticky-sweet, fairy godmother platitudes coupled with the dehumanization of the Palestinian and Iraqi people. In both wars the mass murder of civilians by air power caused only a ripple of mild protest.

Dynastic Christian autocrats of antiquity, equated with "persecution" and "religious superstition" by the pundits of our "enlightened era," never implemented any such mass

murder military policy as we saw the Allies commit in World War Two and the Israeli air force perpetrate on Beirut in the summer of 1982. ( Tony Clifton, *God Cried*).

The groundwork for the military policy of total war emerged in Abraham Lincoln's war against Southern independence; especially in the conduct of Generals Sheridan and Sherman. In the Old World, the British war against the Dutch- South African "Boer" civilians was an augur of the forthcoming "blessings" of the 20th century. The British can be acknowledged as the inventors of the first "concentration" camps where thousands of Boer women and children perished.

But while Lincoln was martyred and subsequently canonized as a secular Federal saint, his military practice was reversed by his successor Johnson almost immediately and with the exception of the most foaming abolitionists, the Southern people were soon viewed by their Northern brethren, as much wronged. A similar revulsion occurred in Britain in the wake of the pacification of the Boers.

Hence it would take the Jewish mentality, ascribing to its opponents absolute evil unmitigated in terms of reprisals for any previous Jewish crimes, to create a lasting marriage between modern policies and resources for total warfare and the permanent dehumanization of the people against whom those policies are directed, be they Germans, Palestinians or Iraqis.

It is not only Khazars or their proxies who slaughter civilian populations. World War I was a more than adequate example of the penchant for slaughter on the part of senile monarchs and corrupt politicians and generals, Axis or Allied. But it took the Jewish mentality to paint such slaughter in the terms of a perpetual morality play wherein any crime is permissible provided it is directed against those who have dared to raise their heads against Judaism and who, by Jewish theological definition, can be the only criminals.

### **Hitler and "Jewjitsu"**

The larger question arises concerning whether Hitler really was an enemy of the Jewish people. One does not refer here to a parochial sense of the war years themselves but rather to their long-term consequences. Hitler as a German nationalist who had assigned himself the task of revival of Western civilization amid the decay, saw in the isolation, separation and if necessary, the destruction of world Jewry, the salvation of Germany and European culture.

But the sum effect of his effort was that Hitler was the real founder of the Israeli state. By losing the war against the Khazars he guaranteed them the public relations bonanza of all time and these masters of guilt-inducement took the ball all the way to nationhood.



Hitler's faith in the benevolence of the Judeo-masonic government of Britain and the Jewish ghetto known as the Vatican revealed that he was another one of those naive schoolboys the right-wing in the West routinely produces.

Moreover, his government was riddled with spies and traitors and he gave the most important post of the entire German military, the Luftwaffe, to Göring, who by that time had degenerated into a fat clown out of a comic opera. By 1944 the German people had a popular saying, that, "There was no roof over the Reich." This is not to in anyway disparage the heroism of the individual pilots and commanders of the legendary Luftwaffe's defensive fighter force, which was the best in the world, but rather the criminal incompetence of Göring.

The chief supporters of the revival of Hitlerism in the world today are the Jews. Because they hysterically denounce any honest historical discussion of the virtues as well as the faults of the man and his regime, they are thereby building up immense pressure within the young, who are understandably discontented and therefore, attracted to that which Hitler represents.

When a corrupt society wholly condemns a single individual as the "wickedest man in the history of the world," those discontented elements of society who are convinced that the system under which they live is profoundly evil, will naturally gravitate toward this forbidden, near-mythic figure of evil. Their logic will be, "If this stinking society says he was bad, he must have been good."

The failure to demythologize Hitler, not just in terms of Hannah Arendt's "banality of evil," but by making an appraisal of the man independent of the function and requirements of Allied and Jewish propaganda, would show him to have been both good and bad; a product of his times set within the context of the mass murder-machine the Jewish Communists had got going in Russia from 1917 onward.

### **The Inner Dynamic of Judaism**

Physical persecution of the Jewish people has always and everywhere failed in European history as a tactic for confining the kind of internal influence Pharisees have in native societies.

Pogroms and persecutions are completely counterproductive when dealing with the Jews. It must be remembered that Judaism is an inherently self-destructive, paranoid creed and the various bickering factions within Judaism are at any given time on the verge of civil war. The only factor that can truly unite the Khazars and make them a single force for power on the world stage, is physical persecution and attack.

Without such attack, they inevitably crumble from internal strife. This is why their Sanhedrin secretly promotes and funds violent persecution of Jewish people when such opposition is not present among the resident peasantry of a given nation. If you want to

heal the world, leave the Jews alone, physically. They will destroy themselves or convert and reform.

The problem is, they won't leave us alone. Whenever we get the thing they fear the most going--when we get going what they have--community--that's when they unleash every force in their arsenal against us.

Under the current system, a critic of Talmudism and Phariseism must always be labeled as a fascist. The term is used by people who don't know what it means. The most basic concept central to fascism is the utilization of the power of the state through centralization, to achieve certain sanctioned ends: the unity of the nation, the advancement of technology, the solution to the problems of unemployment and housing.

Fascism as a system of organization has nothing to do with opposition to Jews. The founders of the Fascist party in Italy were Jews. Right wing Zionists of the 1930s and 40s consciously styled themselves Fascists. The Israeli government is allied with the fascist Phalange Party of Lebanon, whose militia police the "security zone" in occupied South Lebanon on behalf of the Zionists.

The most successful fascist government was Franklin Roosevelt's administration whose "New Deal" economic program marshalled the full resources of the state to operate businesses, conduct commerce, confiscate wages and earnings.

The neo-Nazi invective is equally empty and like "fascist" has meaning only as an insult intended to intimidate people who tell the truth fearlessly. It is a manufactured attribute imposed on critics of Judaism by Jews who insist that to expose their religion or its government in occupied Palestine to free and irreverent inquiry is tantamount to being a militarist, a racist and a lover of dictatorship--and this from a militarist, racist, dictatorial Israeli regime.

The greatest weapon against the Zionists is exposure, to have the widest possible study, analysis and dissemination of their authentic teachings and practices in every field of human endeavor. This will not only protect non-Jews but will also help in the conversion of the Jewish people themselves.

Unlike the Allied mass murderers who hold the German people collectively culpable (as historian Daniel Goldhagen has decreed), one cannot and must not hold the Jewish people as whole collectively guilty, but only their leaders, religious and civil, i.e the latter day Pharisees.

The New Testament "blood taint" can no longer apply because the original Jewish race of 2,000 years past is as dead as is the Roman race with which it was contemporary. There is no pure "Jewish" blood today, only a racial melting pot of Khazar, Black and Oriental races designated as "Jewish" on the political expediency.

The greatest allies in the struggle against the evils of Judaism have been in the past and will be in the future, authentic converts from Judaism (for example Nicholas of Donin and Johannes Pfefferkorn).

The emphasis here must be on authenticity, however. The current "Jews for Jesus" movement is a telling example of a sham conversion since this group militantly supports the murders and racism of the Zionist Israeli state in contravention of every Christian principle. They have attempted to make Christ into a Pharisee. This is an abomination and these are no true converts. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

### **Zionists Behind Anti-Jewish Violence**

A productive investigation for an enterprising historian would be the pursuit of the following line of enquiry: to what extent did the Zionist Jewish leadership encourage Hitler's violent anti-Jewish policies and to what extent do they encourage or actually themselves commit violent attacks upon Jews today?

Rabbi E. Schwartz, writing in the *N.Y. Times* of May 18, 1993: "To achieve their goal of statehood the Zionists have always deliberately provoked anti-Semitism...Their interest was not to save Jews, on the contrary, more spilling of Jewish blood would strengthen their demand of the nations for the creation of their state."

Why would Zionists want to assist violent anti-Jewish opposition? Perhaps they understand well that Jewish propaganda requires violent opposition to Jewry and synagogue and cemetery vandalism, in order to expand their influence and power and where none exist they either incite it by means of their control of Hollywood-style, neo-Nazi front groups, or they perpetrate the actions themselves.

### **Just Law Enforcement, Not Persecution**

Jewish murderers, kidnappers, rapists, usurers and those engaged in treason and subversion can be executed by the civil authorities upon indictment, prosecution and conviction in fair criminal trials operated within the safeguards of the common law jury and appeal process. The critical point is that they would be executed not because they were Jewish, but because they were murderers, rapists, kidnappers, usurers, traitors and subversives. Moreover, non-Jewish usury bankers, loan sharks, murderers, rapists, kidnappers and abortionists are even more culpable than Zionist crooks and killers, since the non-Jewish criminals are additionally guilty of betraying their own kind. These would most certainly be liable to a death penalty for their crimes.

In this way the ruling class, arch-criminals in the masonic and corporate elite who seek to escape justice when Biblical forces come to power, on the basis of their skin color or claims about their naivete, will be foiled. The Pharisees could never have gotten to first base in their push for the reign of Anti-Christ were it not for their allies among the

masonic and corporate overclass--nearly dynastic families who are attempting to impose a police state for the benefit of bankers, lawyers, Zionists and their "Aryan" cronies.

## **Equal Rights and Justice**

Legal executions of Pharisees who are guilty of crimes cannot be considered as "violent opposition" to Jewish people because these actions would be meted out uniformly, without regard to race or creed, on the basis of crimes committed by any malefactor. Hence the punishment is a legal rather than a vigilante function of the civil powers who, according to the Bible, "bear not the sword in vain."

There will be those who will ask, "Why accord Jewish killers--or any other killer for that matter--benefit of law? If we know they are culpable, why not just initiate summary executions?"

History teaches that such vigilante acts always denegerate into a witchhunt against innocents with whom the vigilantes have private scores and vendettas to settle, and who exact their revenge by means of lumping their personal enemies into the general category of "enemies of the people." Such actions are the hallmark of the French Revolution and Bolshevism and of Oriental despotism and Latin American societies--forms of corruption and cruelty which are inimical to Biblical and European yeoman values.

In a key exchange attributed to Sir Thomas More by Robert Bolt, More answers the objections of his hot-headed son-in-law, Roper, who urges him to use his position as Lord Chancellor to eliminate his enemies:

"Mrs. More: While you talk, he's gone! (A reference to More's dangerous personal enemy, Richard Rich, who has just left the house).

More: And go he should, if he was the Devil himself, until he broke the law!

Roper: So now you'd give the Devil benefit of law!

More: Yes. What would you do? Cut a great road through the law to get after the Devil?

Roper: I'd cut down every law in England to do that.

More: Oh? And when the law was down and the Devil himself turned 'round on you--where would you hide, Roper, the laws all being flat? This country's planted thick with laws from coast to coast...and if you cut them down--and you're just the man to do it--do you really think you could stand upright in the winds that would blow then? Yes, I'd give the Devil benefit of law, for my own safety's sake."

In the preceding dialogue we observe the ethos later exhibited by the American Revolutionaries of 1776 who were successful in winning and sustaining a revolution

based on justice and equality before the law. Khazars cannot legitimately claim persecution under such a system of just law and enforcement. Indeed, it is the integrity of just such a system which distinguishes our values and way of life from those of Zionists, Oriental despots and banana republics.

## **Deep into the Psychology of Opposition**

Hitler's techniques has been harnessed today in America to the ends of the contemporary corporate, capitalist state and exhibited at great profit at every stadium-sized, "rock muzak" concert and every "Super Bowl" and "World Series."

If there is any genuine, potent, corporate "neo-Nazism" extant today, it exists on the rock stage or the pro sports field, where the same sloganeering, and submission, as was witnessed in the techniques and adulation accorded Hitler and the Nazi party, are put in service of the American capitalist system. But whereas at least Hitler did these things in the name of his nation and indigenous culture, American corporate fascism exists solely to enrich a gangster class of money grubbers.

And lest it be thought that we imagine that only Jews grub for lucre, the lessons of our literature, from the American Mrs. McTeague in Frank Norris' *McTeague*, who out-Jewed the Jewish ragman in avarice, to the Englishman Monks in Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist*, who outdid Fagin in villainy, and Mark Twain's townful of crooked hypocrites in *Hadleyburg*, are all reminders that we are not to imagine that white Aryans possess any immunities from evil or that Jewish persons possess any monopoly upon them.

But they key here is that by casting themselves as hunted fugitives from Christian vigilantes, the Jewish psychology has been able to blackmail humanity into tolerating the Jewish invasion of Palestine and the displacement and murder of its people, along with control of, or inordinate influence over, the money and mass media of every Western nation. In truth Jewish operatives have controlled the governments of the West for decades and in some cases (Great Britain for example), centuries. If we look deep beneath the hoodwink we observe that it is the non-Jewish dissidents who are the victims of the supposed "Jewish martyrs."

## **The Mentality**

When a Jewish professor of philosophy from Louisiana State Univ. attacked the late anthropologist Joseph Campbell as an anti-semite, he phrased the attack not in terms of the quest for the truth about the nature of the Jews, but in terms of how Jews are "disparaged" by Campbell. The Jewish professor said that Joseph Campbell, "invariably disparaged Judaism as literalistic, chauvinistic and parochial--stock anti-semitic epithets." (NY Times Dec. 2, 1989, p. 26).

In other words, Campbell is wrong because he spoke truths that "disparage" Judaism. These truths are identified as coming from a "stock" of epithets that the writer identifies as being hateful or anti-semitic. But since *it is true* that Judaism *is* parochial and highly chauvinistic, how does it become grounds for censure when these truths have been known for hundreds, even thousands of years and form a body of traditional Western observation upon the Jews which the Jewish writer seeks to delegitimize by terming them "epithets?"

Another phenomenon at work is the assumption that Jews themselves have no framework of hate within their own tradition, no "stock epithets" for Christians. Anti-Christianism isn't even a recognized term in the English language. To defend one's Western heritage and point to the stock epithets of anti-Christianism prominent in Judaism, is to practice hate, according to the received opinion of our day.

For Jews to accuse a non-Jew of hating Jews is a noble act of human rights pique. But for a non-Jew to accuse a Jew of hating Gentiles is itself regarded as hateful. This mentality of the hypocritical double-standard is a Jewish mentality.

Jews absolve themselves of much of what they accuse others of. Syndicated columnist Joseph Sobran states:

"The name of this little game is keeping the *goyim* on the defensive at all times. If they can't be refuted, attack them personally: Insinuate that whatever they say in their own defense is actuated by the worst motives, motives which it goes without saying, have no equivalent among Jews themselves, who are always acting in self-defense. The standard public rhetoric only recognizes anti-Semitism, it hardly imagines the possibility of anti-Gentilism...It's as if hatred, fear, suspicion and contempt could only occur on one side.

"...There is no hyphenated cussword in general use to stigmatize hostility to Christianity...Leon Wieseltier can call a cross on a convent at Auschwitz 'sickening,' and nobody condemns him...Israeli soldiers can beat up a priest on the West Bank, then shoot up his church during Mass, and only the Catholic press takes note...If Christians had done such a thing to a synagogue, anywhere, it would have been front-page news, everywhere. (*Wanderer*, Oct. 12, 1989, p. 7; *National Review*, March 16, 1992, p. S-5).

Indeed, in the fabrication of so-called, in the dreadful Newspeak of New York Times-ese, "hate speech" law codes, law makers deliberately design them with the concept of silencing critics of Jews on the assumption that only the critics of the Jews are capable of hate; the supposition being that Jews are immune to hating or if they do hate, their hatreds must be excused in light of the "Holocaust." Michael Thomas, writing in *Hanover Place*, states, "...these days there seems to be quite a few people who shout 'Holocaust!' when given a parking ticket."

Timothy Danson, a Canadian constitutional lawyer, advocates laws for the suppression of critics of Judaism: "...the concept of freedom of speech does not entail the protection

by the courts, of malicious lies." Here we see the axiom that anyone who criticizes Judaism is a liar. This is a totalitarian position and makes the Jews divine in the way the European monarchs and Chinese emperors were regarded as having "Divine Right."

Danson goes on to say, "Anti-semitism does not fall within the category of ideas or opinions that ought to be protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The anti-semite has chosen hate...and therefore he need not concern himself with truth or reason."

This Canadian lawyer is saying that to criticize Judaism or Jews is an act of hate. Because he is totally steeped in the Jewish version of the world this lawyer cannot conceive of the possibility that Judaism might be a tyranny and to criticize tyranny is liberation.

This Canadian Constitutional lawyer states that opposition to Jews cannot be grounded in truth or reason. That is to say, according to Mr. Danson, it is irrational and mendacious to criticize Jews or Judaism. Here we see the creation of a special category of immunity for Judaism.

Mr. Danson goes further and states that those who criticize Judaism are insane criminals: "The anti-semite's point of departure emanates from irrationality..The anti-semite is a sadist, and in the very depths of his heart, a criminal."

Thus the critics of Judaism are dehumanized to the utmost: they are cruel, they are criminals, they are crazy. Criminals and the insane have no rights and this is precisely what this prominent Canadian constitutional lawyer is advocating: that those who dare to criticize Judaism ("anti-semites") be denied any rights.

But the question springs to mind, what of Jews who criticize or hate Palestinians or Christians, are they also insane sadists and criminals who must be dealt with by Canada's "criminal justice system"?

Mr. Danson has the answer: "History speaks of the bloody persecution of the Jews over the centuries." In Mr. Danson's world-view, carefully imbibed from the official history of the Jewish version of education and information, only Jews suffered a notable "bloody persecution." Palestinians and Christians are cast only as the villains, never the victims of Zion. (*Canadian Jewish News*, Aug. 18, 1988, p. 9).

The psychiatricization of the issue is a commonplace. Kenneth Stern, the American Jewish Committee's expert on "hate groups" (they mean gentile hate groups since Jewish supremacists and terrorists are not included) and author of *A Force Upon the Plain: The American Militia Movement and the Politics of Hate* regards the militia, a Second Amendment constitutional phenomenon, as "the eruption of irrational behavior." They are also "paranoid" and possessed of a "deteriorating mental state." (Cf. *N.Y. Times*, Feb. 12, 1996, p. B-2).

Funny, but this writer knows of a nation of people who have *made a religion out of paranoia*. In fact Stern's book is filled with page after page of warnings about an "impending pogrom" against--guess who?

History is more than the records that issue from the official sources and the monopolies on academic investigation. The founding leadership of the communist movement in Russia responsible for the slaughter of 20 million Christians, was predominately Jewish. The mass murder of Palestinian women and children by the Israeli army and air force is a modern example of Jewish atrocities against non-Jews. This slaughter was aided by the Soviet communist Jews who in 1948 smuggled weapons to the Zionists in Tel Aviv using Czechoslovakia as a conduit. (*Christian News*, May 31, 1993, p.7).

One of the bloodiest butchers of Russian Christians was Leon Bronstein, a Jew who later changed his name to Trotsky and was the first commander of the communist Red Army. Trotsky's great, great grandson, David Axelrod, resides in Israel where he terrorizes Palestinian civilians just as his great, great grandfather terrorized Russian Christians. In November of 1990, Axelrod shot to death an elderly Arab couple who were on their way to pick olives in a village near Nablus (*Village Voice*, Nov. 20, 1990, p. 30).

### **Anti-Semanticism**

What is also very interesting about the term anti-semitism which has escaped analysis is that the use of the phrase is itself an instrument of hate since it is a means of equating a person with being "insane," a "criminal" and a "sadist." Persons thus labeled are subject to the loss of employment, housing and civil and human rights.

What is the definition of an anti-semitic act? In so serious a crime, the felonious conduct should be clearly indicated. In spite of much palaver to the contrary, the definition is much akin to the logic of the Red Queen of Alice's Wonderland who said that a word was "Anything I want it to be." Someone is an anti-semite simply by criticizing Jews, Judaism or the Israeli state. In other words, for doing anything that Jews deem offensive.

For example, when journalist Patrick Buchanan criticized the Jewish role in the formation of U.S. Middle East foreign policy, Abe Rosenthal, contributing editor of the N.Y. Times, compared Buchanan to Nazi soldiers who forced Jews into the Warsaw ghetto! (NY Times, Sept. 27, 1990, p. 14). The term anti-semite then, applies equally to the murderers of Jews as to the critics of Jews.

Profesor of Literature Hugh Kenner in a letter to William F. Buckley Jr.: "The points on which I agree with Joe Sobran are 1a)that the state of Israel is mighty arrogant in its presumption of entitlement to U.S. handouts and general compliance; 1b) that a large & influential U.S. Jewish population shares this presumption...2) that 'anti-semitism' is a rather facile label for habitual objections to 1a and 1b...I note from a recent *NY Times* that Abe Rosenthal...was not satisfied with your treatment of Pat Buchanan.



"It is surely evident that such as he will never be satisfied by anything short of a casting of whoever annoys them into outer darkness, and I think it is a mistake to let them control the terms of the discourse. 'Anti-semitism'--here I agree with Joe--has no stable meaning; it can run all the way from gas ovens to a mere wish that Abe R. would moderate his frenzies. And a term that has no stable meaning is simply not a profitable head for rational discussions." (*National Review*, March 16, 1992, p. S-22).

It is questionable whether Kenner's statement would even be allowed once Orwellian "hate speech" criminal codes are fully developed and enforced. Any kind of deep, critical thinking analyzing matters such as who sets the terms of discourse and what the phrase anti-semitism actually means (nothing) and is used for (to silence original thought), are slated to be criminalized. Kenner's reasoned attempt to decide what are the grounds for "rational discussion" would be labeled as "irrational" and "sadistic."

The defense against Prof. Kenner's thoughts must be in terms of the denunciation of a heretic, a "criminally insane hater" who has the gall to deny the True Faith of Absolute Belief in the Infallible Goodness of Judaism. The superstructure of piety is erected over the framework of debate. The state religion of the otherwise agnostic, terminal West emerges--the Church of the "Holocaust"--cloaked in the moth-eaten, dusty, ermine robes not used since the coronations of popes, czars and emperors.

High Priest Eric Breindel of the NY Post announces that "after Auschwitz, express hostility to the essential Zionist endeavor on the part of a Western intellectual requires an explanation." (NY Post, Jan. 16, 1992, p. 27).

The Los Angeles Times decrees the fantastic dogma that public criticisms of Jews are precursors of a Holocaust. (L.A. Times, Feb. 6, 1990, p. A-5).

Milking the guilt-dogma of this state religion, the N.Y. Times alleges that "It reeks of anti-semitism to suggest that survivors of the Holocaust are to be condemned for establishing a haven in the only state in which Jews form the majority." (NY Times, Dec. 17, 1991, p. 20). Here is the sacred state-church dogma of the "Holocaust" in action as it is invoked to block condemnation of the "holy" Israeli people and achieve political gain for the Zionist state.

The association of a stench with condemnation of Israeli murder and dispossession of Palestinians effectively stops any further clearheaded analysis of the terms the NY Times has established for dealing with Israelis. By the same logic, Cambodians must be immune from condemnation if they murder and dispossess ethnic Chinese and Vietnamese in Cambodia, because they too are "survivors of a holocaust" who are "establishing a haven in the only state in which Cambodians form the majority."

According to Prof. Irv Abella, "The Holocaust metaphor being used against Israel is a group libel..." (*Canadian Jewish News*, Dec. 26, 1991, p. 4). Apparently Jews have a

copyright on the word, a proprietary relationship that forbids its application to the mass murders the "holy people" themselves perpetrate upon mere Palestinians.

That we are dealing with a religious impulse rather than merely a debate between competing ideas can be seen in the fact that the believers in the Church of the Holocaust are unable even to imagine an alternative view. Joseph Sobran in his published debate with William Buckley:

"An anti-semite' in actual usage, is less often a man who hates Jews than a man certain Jews hate. The word expresses the emotional explosion that occurs in people who simply can't bear critical discourse about a sacred topic, and who experience criticism as profanation and blasphemy. The term 'anti-semitism' doesn't stand for any intelligible concept. It belongs not to the world of rational discourse, but to the realm of imprecations and maledictions and ritual ostracisms." (*National Review*, March 16, 1992, p. S-5).

Sobran's epigram about anti-semitism being more properly defined as a man Jews hate, is corroborated by the knowledge that when Jews heatedly disagree with one another they sometimes call each other "anti-semites." When Michael Bar-Zohar of the Israeli Labour Party voted for religious Jews to be subject to the Israeli army draft like all other able-bodied young Jews, he was called an "anti-semite" and a "Nazi" by members of the Shas and Degel HaTorah parties in the Knesset. (*The Jewish Ledger*, April 2, 1992, p. 24).

When Israeli Prime Minister Yithak Rabin chose to recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization in Gaza, his Jewish political rivals produced posters showing Rabin dressed in a Nazi uniform. Later this "Nazi" was murdered by a fellow Zionist.

It is fitting that in this most stupid of all ages, when man has become puffed up on his own supposed scientific grasp of the universe he presumes to have mastered, that we should witness the crowning self-mockery of this creed of rational modern progress, in its enslavement to the racist, superstitious religion of Judaism, to which all good citizens of the One World Utopia must make obeisance or stand stigmatized as "anti-semites," a species akin to that of an insect.

The insect analogy is apropos. The former chief of staff of the Israeli armed forces, Raphael Eitan, referred to the Palestinian people as "cockroaches scurrying around in a bottle."

The Blood and Soil ideology of Zionism which has violently dispossessed the native Palestinians of 92% of their land and which guarantees immigration only to Jews, is racist to the core. Equality between Arabs and Jews in the Israeli state is a fiction. Yet, according to the N.Y. Times, to say that Zionism is just that--organized, nationalistic racism-- "remains code language for bigotry." (NY Times, Sept. 24, 1991, p. 30).

By N.Y. Times logic it is an act of bigotry to point out that Zionism constitutes bigotry against Arabs.

*This is the Jewish mentality par excellence.*

They've internalized their chauvinism to such an extent that they are literally incapable of objectivity or dispassionate examination of their own foibles, pretensions, myths and legends. And the idea that speaking out against the racism of Zionism, is some form of racism, is a palimpsest of fraud. Beneath the branch of Zionism is an even more unlovely tree, the ferocious hate-mongering at the very heart of the religion of Judaism.

## **Tall Tales**

Only a nation of infants who have been spoon-fed the pabulum of relentless Jewish propaganda would question the reality of Judaism's race-hate doctrines.

Jewish *hasbara* (propaganda) is first and foremost based on brazen lying, the more outrageous the better. Though they have accused Hitler of the Big Lie technique they are themselves the chief practitioners of it. In addressing the Jewish leadership, Christ said they were, "Of your Father, a murderer and a liar from the beginning." (John 8:44).

When gas chamber doubter Bradley Smith placed a series of nationwide advertisements in college newspapers for his views, Harvard Law professor Alan Dershowitz rushed to respond, denouncing Smith nationally in print as a "known...anti-Black racist." This was a complete lie made up out of thin air. Said Smith, "So far as anti-Black racism goes, in all the stuff I've written over the last 20 years I've never written a word on that issue. It can't even be argued. It's a complete invention...They make any accusation that comes to mind, confident that media won't try to find out the truth of the matter." (*Smith's Report*, Dec. 1991, pp. 2-3).

A few years ago National Public Radio (NPR), a taxpayer financed enterprise, championed the cause of 72 year old David S. Rubitsky, who claimed that only "anti-semitism" was keeping him from receiving the Congressional Medal of Honor for having single-handedly killed more than 600 Japanese soldiers in a battle. According to Rubitsky, he fought off waves of Japanese soldiers in all-night fight and saved his battalion. He said Japanese bodies were "piled like cordwood." He told reporters: "Some were still alive. Some I just hit in the shoulder and couldn't move. Some in the legs. So I would just shoot them and bayonet them, shoot them and bayonet them. I was a completely insane man."

As soon as NPR and the NY Times discovered that there was a Jew who was not getting the highest military award, that magic explanation for all Jewish troubles, "anti-semitism," was summoned. The Times and NPR reflexively played the hound to the U.S. Army's hare. As it turned out, Rubitsky's account was conclusively proved false. Rubitsky's evidence, a Japanese inscription on a photograph, was judged by both military experts and historians in the U.S. and Japan to be "100 percent...a forgery."

However, since this was a Jew the media were dealing with, the NY Times conceded that, "In a reflection of the *delicacy of the matter*...Army officials and members of Congress were careful not to portray Mr. Rubitsky as a deliberate liar...simply an honorable old soldier with a foggy memory." (NY Times, Dec. 16, pp. 1 and 14; Dec. 17, 1989; also cf. *Researcher* newsletter, vol. 3, no. 5, p. 1). Indeed it must have been a *very* foggy night out there in the Pacific.

One wonders if the perpetrator of this little yarn had been an aging, hillbilly, good ol' boy from north Alabama, what pyrotechnic paroxysms of pointed media indignation would have been directed at his church, his culture and his community?

The same "foggy memories" applied in the Israeli trial of Cleveland auto-worker John Demjanjuk, where several Jewish "eyewitnesses" swore, without a trace of doubt or shadow of uncertainty, that Demjanjuk was the infamous "Ivan the Terrible," gasser-general of Treblinka. Demjanjuk was convicted and sentenced to hang on the strength of these "honorable old" Jewish "eyewitnesses." Only later did researchers working for his family prove that Ivan the Terrible was long dead and Demjanjuk was not him.

To say that some Jews are known for telling lies is not wrong if it is the truth.

But the Jewish response is not to argue the point, but to categorize it and place it in their mad panopoly of pathology. In the Jewish mentality, to indict some Jews for a crime of which they are guilty is a form of sickness. Hence to say that some Jews are known for a propensity to lie, will not evince an admission from Jews that the Congressional Medal of Honor seeker was a fraud ,as are many so-called "survivors" of the "Holocaust."

But rather, the Jewish response is to say that accusing Jews of lying has been part of the "familiar libels" and "stock charges" of history. No real defense is offered, only the demand, based on the prestige and media clout of the Jews, that they are to be believed and their critics silenced and reviled. Elemental discourse with Jews becomes impossible under such circumstances because Jews insist on non-negotiable absolutes: that they are, by divine right, God's master race, and that traditional Western Civilization's portrayal of them as money-mad, liars and extreme racists is always wrong.

This Jewish stance necessitates an investigation into what Jewish tradition holds about Western Christian civilization and Gentiles in general to determine if it is Western tradition that is wrong and Jewish tradition blameless, or whether they may be something evil within ancient Jewish tradition.

That we have the right to sift Judaism for evil traditions is certainly a turnabout of fair play since leading Jewish spokesmen have been condemning Western traditions as evil since the rise of mass communications. Denying us the right to sift their tradition for evidence of evil and criminality while they do it to us constantly, is the Jewish mentality in action.

Take for purposes of citation, the New Testament story of Jesus chasing the Jewish money-lenders out of the Temple. If we suggest that there might be a co-equivalent in our time of Jewish capitalists robbing the economies of the West, Zionists will condemn the point not on the basis of fact but by screaming "anti-semitism" and trotting out their shopworn cliches about "reeks of a stench of bigotry," "an accusation worthy of medieval inquisitors" and other similar linguistic devices intended to avoid debate on the merits or lack of same of the accusation.

Yet the facts speak for themselves: nine out of ten of the people indicted in Wall Street insider-trading securities' fraud are Jewish. James B. Stewart's 1991 book about the chief Wall Street money-changer crook of our time, the Khazar Michael Milken, is aptly titled *Den of Thieves*. The sad fact is that, whether 2,000 years ago or now, some Jews have an innate propensity for crooked financial dealings.

This is admitted privately by the Jews themselves. Chaim Bermant is an orthodox Jewish columnist for the national Zionist newspaper *Jewish Chronicle* based in Britain. In his writing of March 1, 1991 he upholds the observation that Jews are essentially dependents who must prey on a productive people in order to survive.

Chaim Bermant asks:

"...why are Jews wildly successful at making money everywhere else in the world except Israel?..in Israel there are no Gentiles, i.e. no suckers waiting to be got the better of. Where everybody is on the ball, how can anybody score goals?"

This is the truth about Israelis from the mouth of a Khazar himself, whose opinion carried enough of the ring of authenticity, to be repeated in print in a major Jewish newspaper. Yet if you or I repeat this truth we are subject to invective and even prosecution.

Yet I maintain that many Irishmen have a propensity for alcoholism, many Germans for petty bureaucracy, many Americans for mindless Babbitry, many Scotsmen for parsimony and many Englishman for homosexuality. Whether I am right or wrong in these characterizations should be argued on the basis of historical fact and statistical analysis, not hysterical screaming and laws intended to criminalize one's thoughts and writings.

In fact, though Irishmen, Germans, Americans, Scots and English might not like what I have to say and might counter forcefully with facts and figures of their own to dispel my conceptions, few of them would seek to pass laws to imprison those who hold such uncomplimentary views, probably because deep inside, these Irish, Germans, Americans, Scots and English know their own worth as great peoples who have led great civilizations.

**Jailers, Inquisitors and Thought Controllers**

It is the Zionists who have such tremendous insecurities about their contributions to world history and if truth be told, a clandestine knowledge of the truth of their critics' accusations, so that they must resort to the jailer's turnkey to maintain their world hegemony. It is because the truth carries its own special sting that Jews call for the imprisonment of their intellectual critics.

The persecution trombone will inevitably squeek out a long row of shrill notes at this juncture. At long last, a commonsense approach to this subject must be argued. If Jews habitually lie and cheat whose fault is it if they are "persecuted" as they call it? The more proper word is prosecuted.

Moreover, in the annals of history the Irish have been among the most persecuted people on earth. The treatment of the Germans in the U.S. during World War One bordered on a lynch-mob mentality and at the end of World War Two, millions of German civilians perished as a result of deliberate mass explosions and population transfers. Thanks to Jewish influence over the media of mass communications, little or none of this is known to the public.

More importantly, we are enjoined to speak the truth no matter what the consequences, come what may. It is the mentality of a slave to hold back or suppress the truth because of what may result from having spoken or written it. The "poisection" claim of the Khazars is no grounds for refusing to tell the truth about them.

All learning is based upon curiosity and curiosity is the unfettered exploration of that which is interesting. The weird halo of immunity which surrounds the Jewish nation is a highly interesting sanction and no scholar must be faulted for defying it. To pretend that we must approach the Jewish question with some special reverence and reserve, fearful of causing offense, is a totalitarian expectation.

All investigations must be free and impartial and lead wherever the evidence leads; anything less is Orwellian. Only in the presence of a dictator are we compelled to exhibit a fawning sychophancy and certain Jews have become every inch the dictators of what constitutes the "proper" bounds of writing and research, as surely as any Ming Dynasty emperor or Stalinist commissar decreed the perimeters for scholars in those eras.

Such a dictatorship of the mind can only be rightfully resented.

### **The Talmud: The Original Hate Propaganda Volumes**

What is clear from this debate is that either one heritage or the other must be indicted as evil: either Western Civilization was irredeemably evil for having prosecuted and punished the saints and angels who comprised God's Chosen Representatives on Earth, or Judaism is an evil creed which instills in its followers a willingness to lie, cheat and murder those whom their [Talmud](#) dehumanizes as *goyim*, resulting in natural resistance from non-Jews.

Isn't it interesting that while it is considered utterly correct, moral and proper to paint the whole of Western Civilization as evil for alleged crimes against the Jews, it has been ruled totally inadmissible, immoral and racist to condemn Judaism as an evil force?

In this matter of the Talmud and the allegation that Jews ferociously hate and despise non-Jews as part of their religious instruction, we can argue from a body of facts and documentation which will send those liberals who are always calling for dialogue, scurrying for the nearest police station to demand our arrest.

They do not want and cannot endure a frank, open dialogue on the contents of the Jewish sacred book, the Talmud, or on the extent to which Judaism is infected with institutional racism and hatred for non-Jews. Like any superstitious zealot, they are content to conform to the official decree of the state religion of "Holocaust" piety. Critical analysis and thinking independent of received opinion--faculties cited as absolutely indispensable by liberals when considering any other religion--are discarded when it comes to Judaism. Here one is abjured only to bend the knee, tip the hat and be on one's way.

This cowardly betrayal of our God-given powers of reason--also advocated by conservatives--should anger any researcher or scholar worth his or her salt and that anger ought to be translated into the most rigorous and thorough, impartial examination of Judaism it is within our power to render. Such an examination, to be valid, must begin with the Jewish sources themselves.

Whenever the subject of hatred and racism in the Talmud is raised, certain Jewish rabbis nearly always respond with a barrage of name-calling, coupled with a statement that the Talmud is free of all such negativity. This is the official position, promoted in the media intended for consumption by Gentiles. But let us see what the Jews say in publications intended for each other.

*The Jewish Press* is reputed to be the largest Jewish newspaper in America. Politicians court it for endorsements and orthodox Jews consult it for instruction. Rabbi Simcha Cohen writes an authoritative teaching column in *The Jewish Press* entitled, "Halachic Questions."

In his column Rabbi Cohen stated, concerning the Talmud's view of "heathens," that is, non-Jews, that they are "animals." Rabbi Cohen writes that the Talmudic teaching that non-Jews are animals can be found in the Talmud books Gemara Kiddushin 68a and Metzia 114b. (*The Jewish Press*, Feb. 19, 1988, p. 10A).

Jewish men are admonished not to marry a non-Jewish women because such women all have the status of *zona* that is, prostitutes. According to Rabbi Samuel A. Turk, writing in *The Jewish Press* of June 22, 1990, p. 38, quoting the halachic authority, Gentiles are not allowed to marry into Israel because Israel must have within it "no harlot;" and "neither shall there be a sodomite." In other words, non-Jewish men are all regarded as homosexuals and non-Jewish women are all regarded as prostitutes.

Furthermore, according to Rabbi Simcha Cohen, if a Jewish woman marries a Gentile man, she becomes a *zona*, that is to say, a prostitute. Rabbi Cohen:

"...marriage to a Gentile can never be sanctified or condoned, such a liason classifies the woman as a *zona*...common parlance interprets the term *zona* to refer to a prostitute..."

This is qualified by Talmudic authorities in that a Jewish woman would not be called a *zona* who conducted a prostitution service exclusively with *Jewish* men: "Indeed, premarital sex of a Jewish woman to a Jewish man does not automatically brand the woman a *zona*..." A Jewish woman becomes a prostitute or *zona* in the eyes of the Talmud only when she marries or otherwise has sexual relations with a non-Jew. (*Jewish Press*, Feb. 19, 1988, p. 8C).

The Talmudic view of non-Jewish women as prostitutes is widespread among Jews. The Yiddish word for a Gentile woman is *shiksa*, which means whore, from the Hebrew root word, *sheigetz* ("abomination"). The Yiddish word for Gentile girls is *shikselke*, meaning "little female abomination." (Chaim Bermant, "Some Carefully and Carelessly Chosen Words," *Jewish Chronicle*, May 17, 1991).

These unlovely racist-Jewish appellations have been transliterated into English slang in American popular culture in the use of the word bimbo ("stupid whore") as an insulting description of good-looking, blonde White women. A classic example of the Jewish hatred of such women was exhibited by Lisa Schwarzbaum in her essay entitled "Blonde Ambition," which was published in the *NY Daily News*:

"The garden-variety bimbo of today is a woman who is inescapably blonde, inevitably busty and invariably about as intellectual as a Cheez-Doodle...She beams her 40-watt brilliance...She's called Jessica or Donna or Marla, and she comes to our attention because she has been spotted in a motel room with a televangelist...City women swear we wouldn't want to trade our higher consciousness for their low wattage. We bemoan their unfeminist feminine wiles." (*NY Daily News*, May 27, 1990).

Could it possibly be inferred from Miz Schwarzbaum's writing that she is guilty of the "group libel" of Gentile women? Imagine the howls of condemnation and the cries for imprisonment were a White Christian woman to pen an article entitled, "Jewish Feminist Ambition."

The bimbo insult, like so many other racist Jewish epithets, has been picked up by the heartland and the mainstream and resounds through small town America as a self-hating put-down used by Gentile women against other Gentile women. The racist nature of this insult isn't even glimpsed, nor does any "anti-racist" campaigner trace its origin in the depths of institutionalized Jewish contempt for Gentile women.

With regard to the "Who is a Jew" debate, it is officially stated in the Establishment media, that any Gentile, if sincerely converted to Judaism under the auspices of properly



constituted orthodox rabbinic authority, becomes a Jew. However this is by no means the unanimous view of the rabbis themselves or of the Talmud. In fact, the Talmud decrees that "...a Gentile can obtain some rights when he is powerful and especially when he poses a threat to Jews." (Israel Shahak, *Ha'aretz*. April 5, 1990).

At present, the Israel state is dependent upon the good will of the Gentiles of the West for financial support, military aid and cooperation in propagating Israeli versions of current events and history. Therefore, at present, Gentiles are accepted as Jews if they convert, have the proper sincerity and are examined and received by the strict orthodox rabbis. To do otherwise would be to reveal that Judaism is a religion of self-worship (the Jewish race is itself god), based upon the notion of Jews being the Master Race.

For those who search the Jewish scriptures, an inner teaching on the status of Gentile converts to Judaism is revealed, a teaching which awaits enforcement at a later date, when Jews are all-powerful, but which points to a mentality of clandestine contempt orthodox Jews have toward converts to Judaism.

Hence Rabbi Helbo in the Talmud passage T.B. Yebamos 109b states, "Proselytes are hurtful to Israel and a sore on the skin." (For confirmation of this passage, see Rabbi Sammuel Turk, *Jewish Press*, Feb. 19, 1988, p. 10). A further indication of the true status of the Gentile convert to Judaism can be found in the fact that the marriage of a Jewish priest to a Gentile convert is prohibited (Simcha Cohen, *Jewish Press*, Feb. 19, 1988, p. 10a).

More ominous is the statement of the pre-eminent Jewish rabbi of antiquity, Shimon Ben Yohai, to whom the Jewish holiday of Lag B'omer is dedicated. Rabbi Yohai stated, "Even the best of the Gentiles should all be killed." (Isidore Singer, "Gentiles," *Funk and Wagnalls Jewish Encyclopedia*, p. 617, 1907 edition; also cf. Talmud-Minor Tractates, Soferim 15, Rule 10).

Assuming that the "best of the Gentiles," in Jewish eyes would be those who seek to become Jews, one can suppose that Rabbi Yohai's statement will at some future date warrant the elimination of those Gentiles in the Israeli ranks who carry the label of convert. Though the pre-eminent Jewish law interpreter of antiquity has commanded their death, permission to delay or counteract Jewish law is given where Gentiles are still in a position to create a danger for Jews.

In discussing the Talmudic prohibition of giving food cooked specifically for Jews to either "Gentiles or dogs," an exception is allowed: "...the Jews were permitted in some cases to serve Gentiles food cooked only for Jews. For example, permission was given in a case where a Gentile might feel insulted enough to cause a danger to Jews." (Israel Shahak, *Ha'aretz*, April 5, 1990).

That contempt for converts is widespread, if seldom remarked upon in the controlled, secular media. In the Ask-the-Jewish-Lawyer column of the *Canadian Jewish News*, a

Jewish mother whose son married a German woman who converted to Judaism wrote the following:

"We never wanted her as our in-law. She cannot give us "*naches*" (the feeling you get when your one-year-old starts hobbling for the first time), being of a heritage that we do not respect as my husband is a Holocaust survivor. We do not consider her conversion to Judaism valid. I told my son I forbid this marital union. I would like to have his name erased from our family name. How can we do this? We are preparing a will. Will one dollar for him be enough...?"

Attorney John Syrtash replied as follows: "...technically you do not have to leave him anything in your will as a matter of law. However, as a precaution I would put a nominal \$500 in the will, along with an express statement in the will explaining why the amount is so low as it is, drafted concisely and without reference to your ethnic prejudices...If you are sufficiently paranoid you may even obtain a letter from a qualified psychiatrist when revising your will to state that at the time you signed it you were clear-headed and knew exactly what you were doing." ("A Lawyer Replies," *Canadian Jewish News*, Nov. 23, 1989, p. 12).

The reference to "sufficient paranoia" is apposite as we wade further into the mad-house of Jewish law and the Jewish mentality it has bred.

One of the big areas of concentration in *yeshiva* schools (Talmud seminaries) is the lofty subject of the women's menstrual flow. This august topic featured prominently in one Talmud class as reported by the *Los Angeles Times*: "The Talmudic lesson last Monday was on distinguishing menstrual blood stains on a woman's garment from blood spots possibly caused by other sources." The *Times* states that it is important for rabbis to be able to distinguish menstrual blood stains on women's clothing from "...visible blood stains...caused by lice, bed bugs or blood spattered in a butcher shop." (John Dart, "Jewish Scholars Mark 7-Year Study Cycle, *L.A. Times*, April 28, 1990, p.F15).

The Jewess Evelyn Kaye states: "In the code of Jewish law...there are 85 pages of rules, regulations and interpretations covering every minute aspect of the menstrual cycle...The rabbis drew up a series of definitions for 'Regular Periods'...'Irregular periods,' which they divide up into Lunar cycles, Same-Interval cycles and 30 Day Cycles." (*The Hole in the Sheet*).

This fascination with morbid blood is evidenced in the Jewish infant circumcision ritual or *bris* in the course of which blood from the lacerated penis is sucked through a glass tube by a *mohel* (rabbi who specializes in circumcisions) in an act known as *metzitza*. According to the rule of the *Shulchan Aruch* (the codification of the Talmudic *Mishnah*), any *mohel* who dispenses with the blood-sucking must be "removed from his post." Using a surgical clamp to prevent bleeding also renders a *bris* "null and void." According to the Talmud there must be some bleeding resulting from the *bris*. "Using a clamp to prevent bleeding defeats one of the purposes of the ritual and

makes it invalid." (Cf. "Doctor Challenges Female Mohel's Status," *Canadian Jewish News*, Jan. 21, 1993, p. 31).

Israel Shahak talks about the "shock" that is "bound to occur" if people actually "find out the truth...about...Judaism...what Judaism was really like when Jews were governed by that *Halacha*" ("the correct path," i.e. as prescribed in the Talmud).

Shahak states: "As to the concept of 'saving souls,' (*piku'ach nefesh*) the Talmudic literature makes it clear to anyone who reads it, even cursorily, that this concept is inapplicable to Gentiles. In principle it is forbidden for Jews, including Jewish doctors, to save the life of a Gentile, for what we could call humanitarian reasons. Saving the life of a Gentile and thereby violating the Sabbath is even more strictly forbidden. However, in the case of 'saving the soul' of a Jew, such violation of the Sabbath is not only mandatory it is counted as a good deed...There have been endless Halachic debates, which still continue today, on whether 'soul saving' should apply only to Jews or whether Jewish fear of Gentiles and their enmity should result in a dispensation to save Gentile lives...In Israel a few years ago, the Haredi 'experts' for such matters ruled that a Jewish doctor, when he is afraid that the authorities of any state may revoke his license if he refuses to treat Gentiles...can obtain a dispensation, provided that during the treatment he thinks about the dispensation rather than about the treatment itself." (Israel Shahak, "The Status of the Gentile in Jewish Religious Law and Israeli Politics," *Ha'aretz*, April 5, 1990).

Prof. Shahak illuminates a central underlying tenet of Judaism: that it does not express its overwhelming hostility to the non-Jewish world where it lacks the political and military might to do so, but once it possesses that might, it shall move swiftly against the Gentiles: "...according to Halacha a Gentile does not possess any self-evident rights vis-a-vis a Jew. A Gentile can obtain some rights when he is powerful and especially when he poses a threat to Jews. The more a Gentile threatens Jewish lives, the more Halachic rights he will be granted.

"It therefore becomes clear that...if the Arabs do not have chemical weapons, if their armies become weaker, and if the Intifada (Palestinian uprising) is crushed, Halacha will not only prohibit any retreat from the territories, but it will also prescribe the beginning of the expulsion of the Gentiles, especially of the Christians, along with the destruction of their churches. If a miracle happens and...Israeli influence in the U.S. increases a thousand-fold, the Halacha will compel us to expel all Gentiles not only from all of Palestine but also from 'all places which we shall conquer...' (Israel Shahak, op. cit.).

Jewish scholar Shahak gives the Talmudic teaching on Christianity and how it is to be treated when Jews are strong: "...the churches of the Christians in Palestine...are places of idolatry. Conversely we are obliged by our religion (Torah) to destroy all idolatry and idol worshippers and to pursue it until we obliterate it from all of our country and from all the places which we conquer." (Shahak, op. cit.).

The words of Israeli Talmud scholar Israel Shahak, first published in the Israeli national newspaper *Ha'aretz*, will come as news to most non-Jews.

Let us tread further down the path of Jewish hatred for non-Jews. Here is the late Rabbi Meir Kahane advocating in 1990 the mass destruction of the German people: "When it comes to the Amalek of our times, Germany, there is an on-going war, a never-ending war, a war for generations...There can never be forgiveness or contact or relations or anything to do with them. They are beyond the pale and daily, the Jew must pray for the ultimate destruction of a German people that never received an iota of the punishment they deserved...If the Almighty ever allows me to become Prime Minister of Israel...there will be nothing but an Amalek whose memory we will blot out as much as possible until the great day when the Almighty finishes the *mitzvah* of vengeance." (Rabbi Meir Kahane, "Halachic Overview," *The Jewish Press*, Oct. 12, 1990, p. 49).

In March of 1986, the Israeli army's chief chaplain on the occupied West Bank, Rabbi Shmuel Derlich, distributed a 1,000 word pastoral letter to Jewish soldiers calling for the total extermination of Amalek. "Derlich wrote that it is the duty of 'a king in Israel...to eradicate Amalek without leaving any trace...one must show no pity for any creature from the nation of Amalek--man, woman, child...There is no doubt that in the last generation we met the Amalekite enemy...in the form of the German nation,' he wrote." *Jerusalem Post*, May 17, 1986.

Harvard University's Jewish professor of law, Alan Dershowitz, who was cited earlier lying about revisionist Bradley R. Smith, in his book, *Chutzpah*, stated, "The rebuilding of postwar Germany into one of the world's most affluent nations is a moral disgrace. A minimal appropriate response to the collective responsibility of the German people for the crimes of their leaders...should have been a generation of poverty."

Janet DeLynn (a.k.a. DeLynnski): "...I am glad Israel has the atomic bomb, and the continued existence of Israel is the only cause for which I consider it justifiable to use nuclear weapons...maybe we could have tried the A-bomb on Germany rather than Japan...What practically speaking, can one do with a nation (Germany) in which virtually everyone over the age of ten, twelve, fifteen...was either a participant in or accessory to murder?" (*Testimony: Contemporary Writers Make the Holocaust Personal*, p. 65, quoted in *Instauration*, May, 1990, pp. 20-21).

"Rabbi Charles Rosenzweig of West Bloomfield, Michigan, stated that 'Germany's guilt is absolute' and that forgiveness 'is not possible.'" Dov Shilansky, Speaker of the Israeli Knesset, said that 'Even in a thousand years, the shame of Germany will not be erased.'" (*Liberty*, July, 1990, p. 14).

"I had avoided Germany because I did not choose to try to keep a civil tongue or civil face among those I felt would have stood by while my children and I were murdered...And I felt I knew all I cared to know then about German history and the German soul. On both, every Jew is a specialist." (A.M. Rosenthal, *Press-*

*Enterprise*, [Riverside, Calif.], April 27, 1990. Mr. Rosenthal is the former managing editor of the N.Y. Times).

"In history, Germany was not the only criminal nation, just the most vile." (A.M. Rosenthal, "Our German Business," *N.Y. Times*, September 22, 1992, p.27).

"One of those rankling questions is why is it that Germany, which visited upon the whole world, and especially upon the Jewish world--an unprecedented hell of war, barbarism and assembly-line killing of millions of Jews, should have turned out to be a prosperous, powerful and even prestigious country. We wonder why in *heaven's name*, this country of savage murderers should have risen from the ashes of defeat to become a land of tranquility with a standard of living far above those countries which sacrificed the flower of their youth to stop the Germans from enslaving the entire world." (Rabbi David B. Hollander, "The Torah," *Jewish Press*, December 8, 1989).

"Germans are an abomination to me. I'm glad Dresden was bombed for no useful military purpose." (Mordecai Richler, *Vancouver Sun*, Sept. 13, 1966).

"The two greatest evils of this century...both came out of Germany...Arrogant overstatement is another endearing German trait." (Don Feder, Conservative Jewish columnist, *Gazette Telegraph* [Colorado Springs, Colorado], April 26, 1989).

"Let Austria decide whether it is a civilized country or the dirty anti-semitic dogs that they have so far been." (Edgar Bronfman, President, World Jewish Congress, *Globe and Mail*, May 8, 1989).

The world will be saved, "...if the world were to acknowledge its collective guilt against the Jewish people." (Moshe Holczler, "Open Your Eyes, World," *The Jewish Press*, Nov. 23, 1990, p. 12).

"Hostility toward non-Jews has along history in the Jewish world...It's no secret that Jews disparage non-Jews behind their backs. Some Jews brag about tricking them in business, others shun them socially. The Yiddish phrase *goyishe kup* (a non-Jewish head), indicates someone stupid or foolish. In Jewish literature, the non-Jew is often portrayed as someone who is untrustworthy, dangerous or hateful." (Michael Lerner, *Utne Reader*, Jan./Feb. 1991).

Imagine that a former mental patient, who now heads the Texas Ku Klux Klan, is driving through the Black ghetto in Houston with his grandchildren and rocks are thrown at his car by Black demonstrators. The Ku Kluxer immediately stops his car, hops out and indiscriminately opens fire with an automatic pistol, missing the Blacks who threw the rocks and killing a Black shopkeeper who had nothing to do with the incident while also wounding one of his Black customers. The Klan leader then walks through the Black ghetto firing his weapon, kicking at debris and shouting "Nigger."

What would have been the reaction of the U.S. and international media to such a case? What would be the Klansman's well-deserved sentence? 300 years in prison? 500 years? Death by lethal injection?

A case equivalent to this happened in the Israeli state.

Moshe Levinger, a Jew who spent "some of his youth" in a Swiss psychiatric facility, is the head of the *Gush Emunim*, a Zionist settler group which believes that Arabs "are dogs" and that Palestinian land must be taken by force of arms.

On Sept. 30, 1988, Rabbi Levinger was driving through the Palestinian village of Hebron when his car was hit by stones. "...according to numerous witnesses, Levinger parked his car from harm's way and then walked determinedly toward the demonstrators, firing his pistol indiscriminately. Ibrahim Bali, an Arab textile salesman was buying new shoes for his daughter when he heard the shooting. He was standing outside a shop when a bullet tore through his shoulder. A bullet also ripped into the chest of Khayed Salah, who was about to close the metal shutters of his shoe store. The Israeli Army company commander who witnessed the shooting said that after the rabbi fired his weapon, he walked down the road screaming, 'You're dogs,' at Arab vendors, kicking over vegetable crates and flower containers..." (Robert I. Friedman, *Zealots for Zion*, pp. 23, 29, 37-38).

He was sentenced to serve five months in prison and was honored at a celebration prior to beginning his sentence which was attended by well-wishers including Israeli General Yitzhak Mordecai, military commander of the West Bank as well as the President of Israel, Chaim Herzog. A religious ruling on Rabbi Levinger's attack was prepared by Rabbi Moshe Neriya and published in the national Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* of May 13, 1989, in which the rabbi ruled that every Jew has the duty "to shoot [Arabs] left and right without thinking and without hesitating."

Rabbi Moshe Levinger was released from prison after serving two and one-half months of his sentence. The sentence reflected the religious opinion of Rabbi Yitzhak Ginsburg, who has offered "justification for the view that the spilling of non-Jewish blood was a lesser offense than the spilling of Jewish blood. 'Any trial based on the assumption that Jews and goyim are equal, is a total travesty of justice,' he said. (*N.Y. Times*, June 6, 1989, p. 5).

Has the reader even heard of Rabbi Levinger much less what he did or the ten weeks he spent in jail for the murder of a Palestinian bystander?

In July of 1983, Levinger's son-in-law and other members of the Zionist *Makhteret* (Underground), described as "the most violent anti-Arab terrorist organization since the birth of the Jewish state...burst into the courtyard of the Islamic College in Hebron during a noon lunch break, tossing a grenade and spraying machine gun fire. Three Palestinian students were killed and thirty-three injured. 'Whoever did this,' declared Rabbi Levinger, 'has sanctified God's name in public.'"

In May of 1990, 21 year old Israeli Amri Popper walked to the Rishon le Zion market where Palestinian day laborers awaited work. Popper opened fire on them with an assault rifle, killing seven men and wounding ten. Israeli motorists got out of their cars and danced the *hora* among the carnage. As the Palestinians bled to death, one dancing Jew asked, "What, only seven dead?"

The Israeli army subsequently shot to death seven more Palestinians on the same day and wounded several hundred more.

"There is no doubt that the Rishon le Zion gunman acted within a society in which the norm exists that Arab life is cheap...treating Levinger like a hero have created this norm..." (*L.A. Times*, May 23, 1990, p. 4).

On October 8, 1990, the first day of *Sukkoth*, the Jewish feast of booths, the Israeli army opened fire on a crowd of Palestinians at the Temple Mount in Jerusalem, killing 17 and wounding 150. At first the Sukkoth Day Massacre was presented by Israeli spokesman as the result of a vicious Arab stoning of Jewish pilgrims at the Western or "Wailing" wall. "In order to blunt criticism of the Temple Mount shooting..the Shamir government launched an obstreperous public-relations campaign against U.S. media's 'biased' coverage of Israel. It's a time-honored strategy in Israel, where many government officials have come to believe that a problem hasn't been invented that a little *hasbara*, or propaganda can't fix....The Jewish community's strong response seemed to intimidate the media, which, with few exceptions, followed Israel's interpretation of events. After the initial flurry of press coverage, the story seemed to die..." (Friedman, op. cit., p. 132).

17 Palestinian civilians had been shot to death by the Israeli army and police. The victims were blamed, even though no Jews were injured by any mass "rock-throwing" as Israeli magistrate Ezra Kama would admit in July, 1991. The official government view became the media's view. "The story seemed to die." The *hasbara* was having its effect as predicted.

What if 17 Jewish civilians had been shot to death by an Arab government, would the media accept the official Arab version as their own? After an initial flurry would the story have been left to die or would it have been made into the Movie of the Week from the Jewish victims' point of view?

As it turned out, to his credit, *60 Minutes*' TV reporter Mike Wallace investigated the case and produced a truthful national network program on the atrocity the Jews committed. Wallace documented that the Israeli massacre of the Palestinians was an unprovoked, brutal crime.

"*60 Minutes* was also inundated with complaints from mainstream American Jewish organizations and powerful, pro-Israel supporters. At a New York dinner party, *60 Minutes* executive producer Don Hewitt got into a shouting match with ABC television's

Barbara Walters, the real estate developer and publisher of *U.S. News and World Report* Mortimer Zuckerman and Mort Janklow, a literary agent, over the Temple Mount segment...A furious CBS chairman Laurence Tisch summoned Hewitt and Wallace...Tisch is an influential figure in the New York United Jewish Appeal-Federation ...Tisch felt the piece was unfair...(and) required more background reporting." (Friedman, op. cit., p. 133).

Rehavam Ze'evi, member of the Israeli Knesset stated, "Every Jew is worth a thousand Arabs." (*Al-Fajr*, Nov. 6, 1989, p. 15).

"...Prof. Dan Scheuftan of the Hebrew University told a Nov. 13 Jewish Student Federation Lecture on the chances for Middle East peace, that all Arabs are violent and all Arabs want to poison baby Jews." (*Canadian Jewish News*, Nov. 28, 1991, p. 38).

"Commercial Hebrew children's literature published in Israel provides a portrayal of the Arab character that is a reflection of Zionist perceptions of Arabs in general, and Palestinians in particular. Such a portrayal of Arabs has not been limited to Israeli Jews alone but has also been transmitted to and accepted by, a large segment of world Jewry and international public opinion, especially in the West. As a colonial settler movement, Zionism realized the importance of portraying the Arab character in a negative light and of depreciating Arab rights in order to justify Zionist actions in Palestine...

"The characteristic image of Arabs in commercial Hebrew children's literature is a grim one. The Arab appears as a criminal...Arabs are also depicted as thieves, stealing because theft is part of their nature, especially from Jews because of 'envy.' Arabs are also shown as swindlers...Arabs are base...Arabs are cowards...Arabs are idiots...Arabs prefer that non-Arabs tell them what to do. Arabs are liars whose word cannot be trusted and whose promises should not be taken seriously. Arabs are dirty in mind...

"There are several reasons for this negative portrayal of Arabs. First is the need to eliminate any respect for Arabs among Jews...Eradicating respect also dehumanizes, thereby rendering acceptable whatever befalls the dehumanized party, including exile, dispossession or even death." (F.E. Asmar, "Israeli Children Imbibe Racism," *Guardian Special Edition*, Spring, 1987, p. 21).

"Forty percent of Israeli Jewish high school pupils hate all, or almost all, Arabs, according to the first comprehensive survey conducted since the outbreak of the intifada...

"The present survey--completed over a period of two years--was conducted by Ofra Meizels, Reuven Gal and Eli Fishof of the Israeli Center for Military Studies in Zichron Ya'acov. In a country-wide poll, the researchers interviewed 5,400 pupils attending grades 10, 11 and 12 in state-secular and state-religious schools." ("40% of Israeli Youth Hate Most Arabs," *Canadian Jewish News*, August 17, 1989, p. 5).



The hatred of the Arabs does not raise the human rights hackles of the liberal and conservative Gentile apologists for Zionism because this hatred is supposedly a justifiable reaction on the part of Jews to Arab *terrorism*.

By the same token, Jewish hatred for Christianity and Jesus Christ are excused on the basis of what the Christians have done to the Jews, making hatred of Christians permissible. One of the many confirmed anti-Christian bigots among the Jews is the writer Hyam Maccoby. His book falsifying the Gospels, *Judas Iscariot and the Myth of Jewish Evil*, is an excellent example of venomous hatred of Christians presented under the guise of promoting the welfare of the Jews. It seems that under this shibboleth, waved like the proverbial magic wand before the eyes of Gentiles, the most vitriolic anti-Christian prejudice is summoned up without protest from the target peoples. By this clever Jewish technique, "fighting racism" is invoked in order to spread racist hatred for Christians and Palestinians.

In Maccoby's book the existence of the Jewish Judas and his act of betrayal, for which Christ said it would have been better had Judas never been born, is denied. According to Maccoby, the whole Judas episode was a Christian plot concocted out of thin air in order to defame the Jews.

Paul Johnson, writing in the London *Sunday Telegraph* (Feb. 23, 1992) states that Maccoby's book is not so much scholarly as an anti-Christian polemic and that, "...the book betrays a certain paranoid attitude to Christianity...the book is not an open-minded inquiry into the reality of Judas. On the contrary it starts with a conclusion and then proceeds to amass the evidence to justify it. This leads him into all kinds of difficulties, notably in disposing of the name 'Iscariot,' where he is at his least plausible. It also obliges him to predicate that the Evangelists and the writer of Acts, were constantly engaged in unscrupulous propagandist inventions for base politico-ecclesiastical purposes. On other occasions however, when their evidence happens to fit in with his theory, they are reliable sources...Maccoby, in short, is too obsessed...to write an objective account of Judas."

In the Jewish mentality, opposing the stereotype of Judas as a cardboard "Jew devil," even to the extent of denying he existed, and attributing the accounts of his treachery to "propagandist inventions" by the Church, is a worthy and necessary endeavor on the part of Jewish writers.

However, when Christians truthfully attempt to wade through the wild tales and exaggerations which attend the so-called "genocide" of Jews in World War Two, because they see in such exaggerations, the unmistakable outline of a cardboard "Christian devil" being mounted by Zionist propaganda, such an endeavor raises a howl of protest from Jews and dark intimations about the motives of those who would seek to correct the record and defend Christianity from libel.

Thus the equation is submitted to the old Jewish insistence on special privileges and status above mankind. They, the Master Race, have the right to investigate historical stories, like the tale of Judas, which create legends of Jewish devilry. But for the mere goyim to do the same, to dare to investigate Jewish tales which foment legends of Christian devilry--this becomes an unpardonable sin against the majesty of Jewish omniscience, infallibility and suzerainty.

In a similar manner the Jews have created for themselves a license to agitate for Jewish racial purity and apartheid for Palestinians, at a time in the modern era when talk of race purity and racial separation are grounds for imprisonment in Britain, France and Germany and expulsion from the politically correct universities of America. It is only to the Jewish Master Race that such racial concerns are licensed and legitimated.

For example, mainstream Jewish groups regularly run advertisements in national liberal newspapers such as the *NY Times* and in their own religious Jewish publications calling for Jewish racial purity.

In the December, 1989 *Jewish Chronicle* a large ad appears, placed by the "Jewish Seminar Movement" (*Chofetz Chayim Torah*). The text of the ad asks, "An Urgent Call to World Jewry...Do you realize we are in dire danger of losing millions of precious Jewish souls through intermarriage?...That the children of intermarriage grow up with complexes and confusion? If you or your friends are on the verge of intermarriage, we plead with you, do not allow a temporary infatuation to ruin your life, the lives of your dear children and help to destroy our cherished and beloved Jewish people."

Imagine if a White heritage group, distressed over the demographic fact that only one in twenty-six of the world's people are White, were to take out national ads arguing against Whites "inter-marrying" with other races, thereby "helping to destroy our cherished and beloved White race." The outrage, the weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth would resound from the editorial pages of the Hoboken Cornstalk Trombone to the halls of the United Nations and media satellites circling the globe in outer space. Leading the attack would be "Jewish service and humanitarian groups," because Jews reserve to themselves alone the right to racial purity and racial separation.

Jeffrey Kwintner, a Jew, writing in the *Jewish Chronicle* of Dec. 29, 1989 says: "...Jews are the only exception. They were destined to be unique. The concept of racial purity within the Jewish nation is not a myth...The only facts to determine Jewishness should be purely an hereditary one regardless of Jewish observance. A Jew is someone from Jewish stock. No one can make a gentile Jewish...We must retain our own exclusivity in order to survive and not be infiltrated by outsiders..."

When the Aryan Nations group established a headquarters in the Idaho panhandle and announced that they intended it as a base for creating a separate nation for Whites in the Pacific Northwest, they were denounced universally in the Establishment media, schools and courts as foul hatemongers and racists. Yet the option of racial separation for Jews is

perfectly acceptable to such liberal organs as the *NY Times*. A headline in the *NY Times* of Dec. 10, 1990, p. 6, illustrates this: "More Jews in Israel Agreeing With Palestinians That Separation Is the Only Solution." The article quotes Minister of Defense Yitzhak Rabin as saying, "We must now recognize the fact that coexistence with the Palestinian population of the territories in one political framework has no chance. The only chance is through the solution of separation..."

No such solution or separation is permitted White Christians in America however. Any talk of disparate peoples being unable to "coexist" in one political framework in the U.S. is grounds for prosecution by the U.S. Justice Department, which is exactly what the Federal government under Ronald Reagan did in 1987 to Louis R. Beam, Jr. Mr. Beam, a former Vietnam helicopter gunner, was placed on the FBI's "Ten Most Wanted" list on charges of "sedition," solely based on his writings and speeches calling for a separate White enclave in America. (He was acquitted of the charge by a working class jury of his peers in Ft. Smith, Arkansas).

The grandiose vision of the Jewish race with its special immunities, privileges and rights was articulated by President Ronald Reagan in a memorable passage from his 1988 speech to dedicate the cornerstone of the U.S. taxpayer-financed, U.S. Holocaust Museum, then under construction in Washington, D.C. In his speech, which was actually written by a Jew, John Podhoretz, son of the fanatical Zionist Norman Podhoretz (cf. *Washington Jewish Week*, Oct. 13, 1988), President Reagan made the following incredible statement, "And we must make sure that when the tall towers of our greatest cities have crumbled to dust in the turnings of time, the Jewish people will still be on this earth to cast their blessings..."

In other words, while the decline of our American cities is inevitable, the decline of the Jews is not. Those who have hastened the decline of our Republic and who curse non-Jews in the texts of their Talmudic books daily and routinely, will be around to pick up the pieces long after all else is in ruins.

For the babysitter of Bonzo the Chimp and his constituency of "Reagan Republicans" and "Reagan Democrats," this is a prophecy to be celebrated and applauded.

The Jew Samuel Gringauz, writing in the January, 1950 issue of *Jewish Social Studies*, referred to the personal, "eyewitness" testimony of Jews concerning the events of World War Two, as "full of preposterous verbosity, exaggeration, dramatic effects...unchecked rumors, bias..."

Historian Gerald Reitlinger, author of a standard reference work on what is termed the "Holocaust," states in his book *The Final Solution*, "...the Eastern European Jew is a natural rhetorician speaking in flowery similes...sometimes the imagery transcends credibility."

**Lying as an Institution**

Lying to Gentiles is institutionalized within the Jewish religion in the *Kol Nidre* rite, when all oaths that were broken in the preceding year, are rendered null and void.

Let us examine a few of the testimonies of the Jews who claim to have lived through World War Two and who are labeled by the instrument of Orwellian Newspeak as "Survivors of The Holocaust."

In an "Op Ed" piece in the *Los Angeles Times*, April 30, 1981, part II, p. 11 a Jewess named Rachel Patron writes an essay devoted entirely to the theme of the most horrifying scene she observed during the war: bars of soap made from "the fat of dead Jews." The article is accompanied by a drawing of a little girl who has scooped nearly a dozen bars of such soap in her apron. Patron writes:

"Mama, Mama, look what I found!" I cried as I ran across the tracks, holding on to the bottom of my skirt, which I'd filled with bars of soap...My mother and I stood in front of the open door, she turning the bar of soap over and over in her hand, while both of mine clutched the skirt holding my treasure. Suddenly mother's face turned ashen and her eyes opened wide with fear, as if locked on the sight of a terrible monster coming to devour her. She said nothing but her fear communicated itself to me and I began screaming, 'Mama, Mama, what happened? What's wrong?'

"She still said nothing. I thought she couldn't hear me.....I started to tremble and then I screamed as loudly as I could and stomped my feet hysterically because I was terribly frightened and I didn't know why. So she had to tell me; not knowing would do me even more harm.

"Grasping me by the shoulders, she said, 'R.J.F. means *Rein Judisch Fett!*' She said it in German, but I understood; it sounds the same in Yiddish: Pure Jewish Fat.

"I let go of the bottom of my dress and all the soap came crashing to the floor, many of the bars chipping and losing their smooth surface. I bent down and started throwing them out of the train, one by one, looking down to see them crushed between the sharp wheels and the steel rails. And all the time tears were rolling out of my eyes..."

This is a certainly a very heart-rending story, a bit sensational and sentimental perhaps, but one of the thousands of tales of German perfidy retailed in the mass media including such august Establishment organs as the *L.A. Times*. Each story serves to illustrate that "terrible monster" the Germans and the civilization from which they came.

Certainly *L.A. Times* readers thought that the story had been thoroughly checked by the editors before it was published so prominently and in so great a paper as the *Times*. While Jews object to the portrayal of Judas as a Jewish devil, no one has the right to object to this stirring and sad portrayal of the work of the German devil.

There is only one problem with the many "Jewish survivor" stories about bars of soap from Jewish fat: Jewish historians themselves admit that this was Allied atrocity propaganda and that it never happened.

In World War One the same idiotic story was told about the Germans by the Allies only in that case the claim was made that Germans made the soap from the bodies of British soldiers.

One cannot lay culpability for such war-time yarns at the door of the Jew alone for virtually every war in history has produced wild exaggerations about enemy forces which kings, generals and politicians have sought to exploit in order to excite their populations to greater sacrifices and martial frenzy.

During the French revolution Robespierre was accused of eating the roasted flesh of priests and of creating a tannery for human skin for making shoes for the *sansculottes*. (Le Blond de Neuveglise [probably a pseudonym of the Abbe Proyard], *La vie et les crimes de Maximilien Robespierre*, p. 279).

Robespierre in turn manufactured atrocity propaganda against LaFayette: "In Robespierre's private war against LaFayette, he often used wild exaggeration. He inflated the Champ de Mars casualties to 1,500 and repeated atrocity stories of children in Brabant being slaughtered in their mother's wombs by LaFayette's soldiers and carried on the ends of bayonets." (David P. Jordan, *The Revolutionary Career of Maximilien Robespierre*, p. 89).

What makes the Second World War different is that it is the first war in which, after it was concluded, the atrocity propaganda was not discredited, but was in fact escalated. Hence in 1981 the prestigious *L.A. Times* devoted a large part of its editorial page to a lunatic bar of soap hoax cooked up by the Allies 35 years before. The "bars of soap from Jewish fat" tale continues to make the rounds of films, books, classrooms and newspapers, the better to permanently stigmatize the German people and the Christian civilization of Europe as monstrous evil.

"Professor Yehuda Bauer, head of the Hebrew University's Holocaust history department and regarded as one of the foremost researchers of the Holocaust, has denied the frequently quoted charge that the Nazis used the bodies of Jewish death camp victims to make soap... 'We do not have to go on believing untrue stories,' Bauer said.

"Raul Hilberg, professor of political science at the University of Vermont and pre-eminent historian of the Holocaust, agrees that the soap rumor, although widespread was probably unfounded.

"There were all kinds of rumors,' he said, noting that a *NY Times* article during the war suggested that Jews were given lethal injections before deportation... Other rumors speculated that Jews were killed in the Belzec camp by electrocution in water... 'All

these rumors are untrue, based on nothing at all,' Hilberg said. 'No evidence has turned up' to suggest that the Nazis used human fat to make soap." (Hugh Orgel, Jewish Telegraph Agency, *Northern California Jewish Bulletin*, April 27, 1990).

Whatever Hilberg and Bauer may say about the rumor-mongering and atrocity tales, the mass media continues to report them as totally truthful, straight news. No matter how preposterous or idiotic, no skepticism is shown, no probing questions asked. We are dealing with a religion here, the most sacred in the world!

The BBC made a *Timewatch* documentary about a group of Polish Jews who are alleged to have "survived the Holocaust by living like and with, the rats in the sewers of Lvov for 14 months." There is even a book, *In the Sewers of Lvov*, dedicated to Leopold Socha, a sewer worker. (Cf. "Subterranean Memories, *Jewish Chronicle*, Oct. 26, 1990).

Then there is the Zeiger family of seven, who for "two terrifying years" beginning in 1942, lived in a "4-foot-deep hole" under Antosh Suchinsky's barn, "afraid to light even a candle.... The quarters were so cramped the adults could not even stand. 'I cannot tell you how horrible the conditions were. There was no air, no food, no light.'" (*Gazette Telegraph*, May 28, 1988).

Vera Kriegel recalls the day in Auschwitz that she was taken into a room where she "saw a wall full of human eyes pinned to the wall like a collection of butterflies." (*Toronto Star*, Feb. 5, 1985).

A Jew named Morris Hubert claims to have been sent to Buchenwald. He says: "In the camp there was a cage with a bear and an eagle. Every day they would throw a Jew in there. The bear would tear him apart and the eagle would pick his bones." (Ari L. Goldman, "Time 'Too Painful' to Remember," *NY Times*, Nov. 10, 1988).

Or how about Berta Yozawitz of Miami, Florida. During the "Holocaust," Berta "was moved to Bergen-Belsen concentration camp. One day, she stole some turnips. She was caught and forced to lick the kitchen floor clean with her tongue." (*Palm Beach Post*, April 11, 1988, p. 1).

Rabbi Dr. Moshe Weiss informs us: "...Nazis transported from the Auschwitz camp to Germany seven trainloads of women's hair from which the Germans produced soft mattresses for the German population. There were...10 trainloads of gold--especially from dental work.." (*The Jewish Press*, April 5, 1991).

A French magazine, *National Hebdo* (May 31, 1990) details how the sacred Auschwitz death toll has fallen dramatically over the years: from 8 million (French War Crimes Research Office), to 5 million (*Le Monde*, April 20, 1978) to 4 million (the figure advertised at Auschwitz-Birkenau up until 1990) to 3 million (the "confessions" of Rudolf Hoss) to 1.6 million (Prof. Yehuda Bauer); to 1.25 million (Prof. Raul Hilberg)

to 850,000 (Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*), to 75,000 (Auschwitz archives in possession of the Russians).

**This concludes chapter one in volume one of THE JEWISH MENTALITY by Michael A. Hoffman II**

Copyright ©1996 by Michael A. Hoffman II. All Rights Reserved.

Published electronically by The Campaign for Radical Truth in History. This copyrighted material may not be reproduced in any format without permission in writing.

<http://www.hoffman-info.com>